

STAPLEFORD TOWN FUND EXECUTIVE BOARD

Friday 19 November 2021 at 10.00 am
Broxtowe Borough Council, Council Chamber, Beeston

PRESENT:

Ian Jowett (Chair)
Paul Sweeney (Vice Chair)
Darren Henry
Zulf Darr
Councillor David Grindell
Councillor Richard MacRae
Councillor Teresa Needham
John McGrath
Tom Spink

WMD Ltd
Robert Ellis Estate Agents
Broxtowe MP
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Stapleford Town Council
Stapleford Community
MyPad

OBSERVERS

Luke Cairney
Jonathon Little
Phillipa Ward (notes)
Melanie Phythian
Colin Hallahan
Aarifah Mohammed

Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Broxtowe Borough Council
Towns Fund Policy Advisor
Faithful and Gould
Faithful and Gould

APOLOGIES:

Ruth Hyde
Councillor Richard Jackson
Will Morlidge
Jenny Adams
Jessica Brannan
Ryan Dawson
Sally Gill
Jeff Edwards
Louise Lyddiatt
David Brierley
Paul Gaughan
Frank Taylor

Broxtowe Borough Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
D2N2
Towns Fund Delivery Partner (ARUP)
Broxtowe Youth Homelessness
Broxtowe Borough Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
Edwards Clegg Solicitors
Hawley and Rogers Solicitors
HS2 Ltd

	ACTION
<u>Welcome and Introductions (Chair)</u> The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
<u>Apologies of absence</u> Apologies of absence were received and noted.	
<u>Agree Minutes of previous Meeting (Chair)</u> The minutes of the previous meeting dated 15 October 2021 were agreed.	

<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>There were no matters arising.</p>	
<p><u>Declarations of interest (Chair)</u></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
<p><u>Grant Offer Letter</u></p> <p>LC presented the grant offer letter from Government to confirm the £21.1m funding for the six projects from the TIP2 bid. He explained that any material changes to projects in the summary documents would need to be reported to Government.</p> <p>MeIP recognised that there would be changes due to the scaling back of projects with the funding being less than the bid. Government would need a rationale why projects might be pushed back if this exceeded 12 months.</p> <p>It was unanimously agreed to write a letter of thanks to The Rt Hon. Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for DLUHC, as suggested by JMcG, for the Towns Deal investment.</p>	
<p><u>Amends to the Local Assurance Framework</u></p> <p>LC presented a copy of the LAF highlighting in green proposed changes. MeIP agreed that DHCLG should be changed to DLUHC throughout. The number of Board Members to be amended to include TS. The ToR would remain at seven Board Members needed to be present to be quorate. All changes were agreed unanimously.</p> <p>JL brought to the attention of the Board, that it may be prudent to consider including a formal co-opt provision and ensure the process around substituting board positions was clear. This was with reference to HS2's current position, so that they could either maintain a presence on the board should DB be unable to attend and/or further organisations be required to join/leave the board in the future.</p>	<p>LC to amend LAF</p>
<p><u>Update on Project Working Groups (F+G)</u></p> <p>CH gave an update for each of the Project Working Groups.</p> <p><u>Learning Facility</u></p> <p>CH presented illustrations of cloaking the library and learning building with laser cut panels which would be a more cost effective option using the money saved from building an extension to the rear which was no longer part of the scheme. There was some remodelling of internal design layouts which will need to be agreed.</p> <p>Further discussions will be required with NCC to develop their assets.</p> <p>DH asked what improvements had been made to the learning facility. CH explained that four teaching rooms/spaces had been added. The library</p>	

would rationalise their services making room on the first floor. These rooms could be split or made larger to create a flexible space for other means. He confirmed that the cladding was merely a curtain and will be secondary to the internal teaching area. TN asked if there was an opportunity to be offered a different external design. CH would offer the most cost effective options with planning and building regulation approval.

PS suggested collaboration between each of the project teams to provide synergy with the aesthetics. CH confirmed that they would be using the same architects across the programme whether each building has its own identity or uniformity. DG advised to note that planning laws change in 2025 which requires conforming to COP26 (environmental and future sustainability).

Community Pavilion

The illustrations of the proposed pavilion showed aluminium panels with different colours to define sections but nothing was definite. The internal layout had been amended to take into account the various shared uses of the building and its circulation.

RMac considered having doors at both ends of the building to prevent excessive walking from the changing rooms through the sports pavilion. CH confirmed that the illustration was indicative and will be revisited.

JMcG questioned how the multi community use would be financed. He was aware that BBC would receive the rent but how would the building be maintained. LC explained that it was not critical to include the operations by the time the business case will be submitted, just to ensure that the building is commercially viable. ZD clarified that BBC were the accountable body who owned the premises and that there will be a business case for running costs of the building and a management agreement for the operator to ensure that it is a sustainable viability.

TS was concerned that the operator would also be a stakeholder who might want to make changes to the building. JL agreed that early contractor/operations involvement was necessary to make it viable and to work together. JMcG suggested talking to LLeisure and invite them to the meeting for the Community Pavilion. DG voiced a Declaration of Interest in LLeisure with his association with the company.

Youth Centre

With more office space being required it was suggested to increase the size of the building. Discussions were needed with each shared service in order to maximise most efficient use of space available.

A meeting with the architects and the NCC youth services is being brokered to agree internal configurations.

RMac expressed his appreciation with all the Working Groups and was pleased to see the mezzanine floor facility at the Youth Centre.

Enterprise Hub

It was important to remain transparent by showing what the building would look like with solar glare panels and how the space would be used with illustrations on hoardings around the building. A draft business case will be required by January 2022 how the works will be drawn down.

TN asked what COP26 environmental standards were required for new buildings. CH suggested using contractors who have BREEAM Accreditation to develop buildings which are sustainable, meet Building Regulations standard and have a carbon life of 40 years. IJ was aware of grants being made available for air source. CH considered a natural ventilation building. DG was mindful of planning and financial constraints avoiding the need for bigger buildings in a few years' time.

SENSITIVE

The car park is on a 999-year lease. BBC still need to clarify their leaseholder position, as the existing car parking elements remain unchanged by the proposal to build up to the existing Poundstretcher building and create a new and attractive frontage to Derby Road.

JL suggested BBC to check minutes of any historic council meetings making reference to the lease.

ZD proposed to seek legal advice and bring back to the Board.

CH noted Walter Parker VC Memorial Square amendment on the slide presentation.

Traffic Management

CH expressed concern that NCC had already carried out work in the town centre and there was some reticence from VIA to provide costs. These will need to be co-ordinated with the rest of the works.

There was debate over the removal of the speed bumps in the town centre. JMcG suggested VIA be invited to attend the meeting when making a decision.

LC reported that he has had conversations with NCC but the speed bumps were to remain to slow down traffic to avoid pedestrian accidents. He however suggested making the humps lower. He clarified that NCC dealt with the planning and strategic matters for highway improvement whereas VIA, who are owned by NCC, carry out the works and offer technical advice and are engaged in the working group. He added that the latest LTN 1/20 overlays were required from NCC.

Cycle Network

CH reported that there had been further suggested changes to the original network proposals by members of the WG. A version of that plan was awaiting scrutiny from NCC officers as to the LTN1/20 compliance of the route. VIA had previously identified options across the network at TIP development

stage, however individual stretches of the route were RAG rated, with a disclaimer of works and/or further clarifications to be sought to deliver those proposals within DFT regulations.

DH proposed key improvements with signage and information boards, dropped kerbs with emphasis on Pasture Road, Ilkeston Road and Hickings Lane triangular cycle route into the town centre. He also suggested a junction box giving priority to cyclists first at Church Street traffic lights. The cycle hub could start at Tiles UK building but somewhere else longer term needed to be finalised for the business case. It was suggested to hold this discussion outside of this meeting.

LC attended a site visit with cyclists to look at the route and stated that if there were no cycle path improvements, alternative treatment of routes such as signage, and potentially lighting, would need to be compliant with LTN 1/20.

There was also a concern that the NCC had only recently met internally to discuss its approach to Town Deals or other regeneration programmes across the County patch, even though some towns signed their heads of terms for town deals in June 2020, in the case of the Stapleford Executive Board engaging NCC from the outset.

LC announced that based on preliminary quotes, it would cost circa £30k to bring the Tile UK building back into a temporary use as a Pop up cycle hub and exhibition space for the Stapleford Town Investment Plan, something which has not been budgeted for previously. RMac and DG suggested instead renting empty shops in the town centre or the use of the pavilion at Queen Elizabeth Park. Other suggestions were to use pop up gazebos or freight containers whilst demolishing the building to create much needed car park spaces or use the space at the rear of the existing Tiles UK building. Consideration would also be needed to install portaloos at the site.

JMcG proposed NCC should connect all cycle networks including the triangular route, Moorbridge Lane to the Nutbrook Trail and link to Eastwood, Kimberley and Beeston for a “mini Holland”.

IJ suggested applying for grant funding from the government’s £2bn cycle investment strategy. DH would speak to Gary Wood, NCC champion, to tap into their Gear Change bid for cycling and walking (known as Active Travel).

Finance Discussion

CH presented each of the projects with their revised high level costings and the methods QS’ had used to calculate them. There were three projects which were currently projected as requiring more capital budget, than afforded by the town deals latest re-profile exercise. As a result, and based on revised projected costs, this leaves the programme with a £1m deficit and no dedicated client contingency sum. He suggested that a cost savings strategy was needed to manage the issue. CH continued that fixed project decisions would be cheaper than changing project/s scope throughout the programme.

ZD shared CH's advice and would prefer to claw back £2m collectively from the individual projects to allow for a further client contingency sum and bring the rest of the programme costs in-line.

LC and CH would discuss options and contingencies to finalise at the next Working Groups. There are also several proposals of reductions to some projects scope and scale in order to preserve the 6 projects of the wider programme.

DG agreed that each Working Group should present their individual Work Programme and Finance details as Exec agenda items to keep track on any potential overspend.

TS was concerned if F+G had sufficient time to prepare the revised layouts following the Working Groups changes for the next Board Meeting. CH suggested to either scale some projects back or cut back all projects with an opportunity to deliver less unless co-funding was made available.

MeIP recommended accessing a Project Prioritising tool which is available on the Government's website. She suggested contacting ARUP (formerly the Towns Fund Delivery Partner) about the Grant Finder tool from Grant Thornton, to help search for potential match funding for the Enterprise Hub to see if there was anything available.

LC offered an alternative approach to the Traffic Management project overspend, by suggesting that VIA (other highways contractor) could be approached to see what they could deliver from the TIP proposals in the "Ban-croft report" within a £2m budget, saving circa £880k for the programme all be it with lesser prioritised interventions dropped from the report.

Communication and Branding – Brief for Commission

LC will circulate a Stapleford Town Deal Communications Support Brief document to Board Members which will provide comms support for a six- month contract. Responses were due to be returned to LC by close of play on Wednesday 24 November what Members would like to have included in the Brief for example digital assets, video footage or branding which will then go out to Tender.

Town Centre Recovery Grant Scheme Update

Communications and Engagement Plan

LC will upload all minutes, the TIP and publish any further information on the website. As part of this, by 26 November eligibility guidelines for those businesses who will be able to submit proposals for the Town Centre Recovery Fund, will be available to view online. This will assist businesses in preparing proposals for grant support once the scheme opens in January 2022.

Launch of Town Centre Recover Fund

On 10 January 2022 the scheme will be launched up until the end of the financial year 21/22. All submissions will be assessed for quality, size and scope, then where necessary the board have provisions to alter the scheme. This will be dependent on the outputs achieved early on in this project.

Further milestones shared with Board members with Comms support brief.	
--	--

<u>Date of next meeting</u> (Chair)	
--	--

Friday 17 December 2021 at 10.00 am, Broxtowe Borough Council Offices, Council Chamber, Beeston.	
--	--

<u>Provisional meeting dates for 2022</u>	
--	--

Friday 14 January at 10.00 am Friday 11 February at 10.00 am Friday 11 March at 10.00 am Friday 8 April at 10.00 am	
--	--

MEETING CLOSED AT 11.50 AM

DRAFT